



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/801,195

03/16/2004

Steve Armstrong

30203/39227

5133

4743

7590

07/02/2010

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
6300 WILLIS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357

EXAMINER

NORTON, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2121

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/02/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/801,195	Applicant(s) ARMSTRONG ET AL.	
	Examiner JENNIFER L. NORTON	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/28/10</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a **Final Office Action** in response to the Amendment received on 01 June 2010. Claims 1-44 are pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 28 January 2010 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referring to Application Nos. 2003-29829 JP and 2008-171571 JP have not been considered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pgs. 9-15, filed 01 June 2010 with respect to claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. In regards to Applicant's argument that U.S. Patent No. 7,363,588 (hereinafter Saleh) does not disclose, "a display that presents entity data in a common display format for each of a plurality of sections specifying the different entity data to be displayed in the same format without presenting the same type of entity data in

multiple different display formats, where each of a plurality of sections is part of a navigational tree specifying different categories of entity data in the database.” (pg. 11, paragraph 4), the Examiner recognizes the Applicant has not accounted for the combination of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/007771 (hereinafter Nixon) and Saleh under 35 U.S.C 103(a) for this limitation as set forth in the Non-Final Office Action, mailed on 31 December 2009.

In the Non-Final Office Action mailed on 31 December 2009 (e.g. pgs 5-7, paragraph 9), the Examiner relied upon the combined teachings of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0077711 (hereinafter Nixon) for a navigational tree having a plurality of sections specifying different categories of entity data; and Saleh for two or more of the plurality of data source applications each presents the data in different visual user interface display formats; and wherein a predetermined viewing format is a common visual user interface display format for presenting entity data associated with each of the plurality of sections specifying the different data to be displayed in a same visual user interface format without presenting a same type of entity data in multiple different visual user interface display formats to meet the claimed limitation of “a display that presents entity data in a common display format for each of a plurality of sections specifying the different entity data to be displayed in the same format without presenting the same type of entity data in multiple different display formats, where each of a plurality of sections is part of a navigational tree specifying different categories of entity data in the database.”

Furthermore, in response to Applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

5. In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, Saleh teaches to providing users with less difficulty in operating, as well as need for training in the operation in a range of different applications (col. 2, lines 53-57).

6. Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 15, 17, 19, 22-25, 27, 28, 30-34, 36, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0077711 (hereinafter Nixon) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,363,588 (hereinafter Saleh).

9. As per claim 1, Nixon teaches a remote data viewing system for use in a process plant having a plurality of data source applications, each of which collects or generates entity data pertaining to one or more different entities within the process plant, the remote data viewing system comprising:

a primary data collection platform (pg. 5, par. [0040]; i.e. XML) **configured to collect (as opposed to actually collecting)** the entity data pertaining to the one or more different entities within the process plant from the data source applications (pg. 5, par. [0040]; i.e. each data originator),

a database (Fig. 2, element 102) **configured to store (as opposed to actually storing)** the entity data pertaining to the one or more different entities within

the process plant collected by the primary data collection platform (pg. 5, par. [0041], pg. 8, par. [0054] and 13, par. [0082]);

a web server (i.e. XML data server) coupled to the primary data collection platform (pg. 5, par. [0040]) and **configured to provide (as opposed to actually providing)** remote access to the entity data stored in the database at one or more remote platforms (pg. 12, par. [0076] and pg. 13, par. [0083]); and

a display application (pg. 6, par. [0042] and [0043]; i.e. user display applications of Fig. 2, element 50) stored on a computer readable memory (pg. 20, par. [0124]) and **configured to execute (as opposed to actually executing)** on a processor within one of the one or more remote platforms to create a display for the entity data (pg. 6, par. [0043], pg. 12, par. [0075] and pg. 20, par. [0124]), the display including a navigational tree (pg. 14, par. [0088], pg. 15, par. [0095] and Fig. 5; i.e. a set or series of hierarchical displays) having a plurality of sections specifying different categories of entity data (pgs. 14-15, par. [0092]) in the database (pg. 14, par. [0094] and pg. 20, par. [0126]) and a display view (Fig. 5A and 5B), wherein the display application enables a user to select the different ones of the sections of the navigational tree to specify different entity data to be displayed and presents the entity data associated with a selected section of the navigational tree in the display view (pgs. 14-15, par. [0088], [0092] and [0094] and pg. 20, par. [0126] and [0127]) in a predetermined viewing format (i.e. common manner/consistent format).

Nixon discloses a system substantially the same but does not expressly teach wherein two or more of the plurality of data source applications each presents the entity data in different visual user interface display formats (pg. 5, par. [0040] and pg. 11, par. [0069]; i.e. each of the different schemas from each data originator); and wherein the predetermined viewing format is a common visual user interface display format for presenting entity data associated with each of the plurality of sections specifying the different entity data to be displayed in a same visual user interface format without presenting a same type of entity data in multiple different visual user interface display formats (pg. 11, par. [0069] and pg. 15, par. [0095] and par. [0096]).

Saleh teaches wherein two or more of the plurality of data source applications (col. 2, lines 22-25 and Fig. 3, element 22 and 24) each presents the data in different visual user interface display formats (col. 3, lines 7-12 and col. 5, lines 8-12 and 45-48); and wherein a predetermined viewing format is a common visual user interface display format (col. 2, lines 32-34 and col. 5, lines 16-22) for presenting entity data associated with each of the plurality of sections (Fig. 2, element 28, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40 42, and 44) specifying the different data (col. 3, lines 6-12; i.e. control features) to be displayed in a same visual user interface format without presenting a same type of entity data in multiple different visual user interface display formats (col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon to include wherein two or more of the plurality of data source applications each presents the data in different visual user interface display formats; and wherein the predetermined viewing format is a common visual user interface display format for presenting entity data associated with each of the plurality of sections specifying the different data to be displayed in a same visual user interface format without presenting a same type of entity data in multiple different visual user interface display formats to provide users with less difficulty in operating, as well as need for training in the operation in a range of different applications (col. 2, lines 53-57).

10. As per claim 2, Nixon teaches as set forth above the predetermined viewing format organizes the entity data based on device tags (i.e. indexes) associated with the entity data (pg. 7, par. [0048], pg. 11, par. [0068], pg. 15, par. [0096] and [0098], pg. 20, par. [0126] and [0127] and Fig. 5A and 5B).

11. As per claim 4, Nixon teaches as set forth above the predetermined viewing format includes a display of configuration data (i.e. the interconnections of process control equipment) associated with the device tags (pg. 20, par. [0126]).

Art Unit: 2121

12. As per claim 5, Nixon teaches as set forth above the predetermined viewing format includes a display of calibration data (pg. 7, par. [0052]) associated with the device tags (pg. 20, par. [0126]).

13. As per claim 7, Nixon teaches as set forth above the navigational tree includes a section specifying one or more plant locations (Fig. 5A, element "Area 1" and "Area 2") associated with the entity data within the process plant (pg. 6, par. [0044], pg. 14, par. [0088], pg. 15, par. [0096] and pg. 20, par. [0126]).

14. As per claim 8, Nixon teaches as set forth above the navigational tree includes a section specifying one or more physical networks (Fig. 5A, element "Area 1" and "Area 2") associated with the entity data within the process plant (pg. 6, par. [0044], pg. 14, par. [0088], pg. 15, par. [0096], pg. 20, par. [0126]).

15. As per claim 9, Nixon teaches as set forth above the navigational tree includes a section specifying alerts (Fig. 5) associated with the entity data within the process plant (pg. 7, par. [0052], pg. 14, par. [0088], and pg. 15, element [0096]).

16. As per claim 10, Nixon teaches as set forth above the navigational tree includes a section specifying calibration entities (pg. 7, par. [0052]) associated with the entity data within the process plant (pg. 20, par. [0126]).

17. As per claim 15, Nixon teaches as set forth above the navigational tree includes a section specifying user defined favorite data associated with the entity data within the process plant (pg. 7, par. [0048]).

18. As per claim 17, Nixon teaches as set forth above the navigational tree includes a section specifying device tags (i.e. indexes) associated with the entity data within the process plant (pg. 7, par. [0048], pg. 11, par. [0068], pg. 15, par. [0096] and [0098], pg. 20, par. [0126] and [0127] and Fig. 5A and 5B).

19. As per claim 19, Nixon teaches as set forth above the web server includes a first application that acquires the entity data from the primary data collection platform as XML data (pg. 13, par. [0083]) and includes a second application that places the XML data into a web page (pg. 20, par. [0125]) using the predefined viewing format (pg. 13, par. [0084]).

If, however the prior art is interpreted differently by a third party, the base reference and secondary reference teach "the web server includes a first application that acquires the entity data from the primary data collection platform as XML data and includes a second application that places the XML data into a web page using the predefined viewing format" as follows:

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nixon in view of

Saleh or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nixon in view of Saleh in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0230897 (hereinafter Latzel).

As per claim 19, Nixon teaches to the web server substantially the same as claimed but does not expressly the web server includes a first application that acquires the entity data from the primary data collection platform as XML data and includes a second application that places the XML data into a web page using the predefined viewing format.

Saleh does not expressly teach the web server includes a first application that acquires the entity data from the primary data collection platform as XML data and includes a second application that places the XML data into a web page using the predefined viewing format.

Latzel teaches to the web server includes a first application that acquires the entity data from the primary data collection platform as XML data and includes a second application that places the XML data into a web page using the predefined viewing format (pg. 3, par. [0043]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include a web server that includes a first application that acquires the entity data from the primary data collection platform as XML data and includes a second application that

places the XML data into a web page using the predefined viewing format to conveniently edit and generate web sites, and provide simplified automated editing of web sites, requiring less technical expertise (pg. 1, par. [0006]).

20. As per claim 22, Nixon teaches as set forth above the web server includes an application that acquires event data from the primary data collection platform in response to a request from one of the remote platforms (pg. 13, par. [0083] and pg. 20, par. [0125]), places the acquired event data into a web page (pg. 20, par. [0125]) using the predetermined viewing format and sends the web page to the one of the remote platforms (pg. 13, par. [0084]).

If, however the prior art is interpreted differently by a third party, the base reference and secondary reference teach "the web server includes an application that acquires event data from the primary data collection platform in response to a request from one of the remote platforms, places the acquired event data into a web page using the predetermined viewing format and sends the web page to the one of the remote platforms" as follows:

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nixon in view of Saleh or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nixon in view of Saleh in further view of Latzel.

As per claim 22, Nixon teaches the web server substantially the same as claimed

but does not expressly teach the web server includes an application that acquires event data from the primary data collection platform in response to a request from one of the remote platforms, places the acquired event data into a web page using the predetermined viewing format and sends the web page to the one of the remote platforms.

Saleh does not expressly teach the web server includes an application that acquires event data from the primary data collection platform in response to a request from one of the remote platforms, places the acquired event data into a web page using the predetermined viewing format and sends the web page to the one of the remote platforms.

Latzel teaches the web server includes an application that acquires event data from the primary data collection platform in response to a request from one of the remote platforms, places the acquired event data into a web page using the predetermined viewing format and sends the web page to the one of the remote platforms (pg. 3, par. [0043]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include the web server includes an application that acquires event data from the primary data collection platform in response to a request from one of the remote platforms, places the acquired event data into a web page using the predetermined

viewing format and sends the web page to the one of the remote platforms to conveniently edit and generate web sites, and provide simplified automated editing of web sites, requiring less technical expertise (pg. 1, par. [0006]).

21. As per claim 23, Nixon teaches as set forth above the navigational tree includes multiple sections (pgs. 14-15, par. [0088] and [0092]; e.g. Fig. 5, element "Areas"), wherein each of the multiple sections specifies a different category of entity data (pgs. 14-15, par. [0092]; e.g. Fig. 5, element "Units") and wherein each of the multiple sections includes one or more associated predetermined viewing formats (pg. 11, par. [0069]) used to view the entity data when selected by a user (pg. 15, par. [0094] and pg. 20, par. [0125]-[0127]).

22. As per claim 24, Nixon teaches a method of viewing entity data generated in a process plant having a plurality of data source applications, each of which collects or generates entity data pertaining to one or more different entities within the process plant, the method comprising:

collecting the entity data pertaining to the one or more entities within the process plant at a primary data collection platform (pg. 5, par. [0040]; i.e. XML) from the plurality of data source applications (pg. 5, par. [0040]; i.e. each data originator);

storing the collected entity data in a database associated with the primary data collection platform (pg. 5, par. [0041], pg. 8, par. [0054] and pg. 13, par. [0082]);

accessing the database (pg. 5, par. [0040]; i.e. via XML data server) from a remote site geographically separated from the primary data collection platform to obtain at least a portion of the entity data stored in the database (pg. 12, par. [0076] and pg. 13, par. [0083]);

displaying (pg. 6, par. [0042] and [0043]; i.e. via user display applications of Fig. 2, element 50) a navigational tree (pg. 14, par. [0088], pg. 15, par. [0095] and Fig. 5; i.e. a set or series of hierarchical displays) at the remote site (pg. 6, par. [0043], pg. 12, par. [0075] and pg. 20, par. [0124]), the navigational tree including a plurality of sections specifying categories of the entity data (pgs. 14-15, par. [0092]) in the database (pg. 14, par. [0094] and pg. 20, par. [0126]); and

displaying a display view (Fig. 5A and 5B) at the remote site in conjunction with the navigational tree (pg. 15, par. [0095] and Fig. 5; i.e. a set or series of hierarchical displays), wherein the display view presents entity data in a predetermined display format (i.e. common manner/consistent format) in response to a selection of one of the sections of the navigational tree (pgs. 14-15, par. [0092] and [0094] and pg. 20, par. [0126] and [0127]).

Nixon discloses a system substantially the same but does not expressly teach wherein two or more of the plurality of data source applications each presents the entity data in different visual user interface display formats (pg. 5, par. [0040] and pg. 11, par. [0069]; i.e. each of the different schemas from each data originator); and wherein the predetermined viewing format is a common visual user interface display

format for presenting entity data associated with each of the plurality of sections specifying different entity data to be displayed in a same visual user interface format without presenting a same type of entity data in multiple different visual user interface display format (pg. 11, par. [0069] and pg. 15, par. [0095] and par. [0096]).

Saleh teaches wherein two or more of the plurality of data source applications (col. 2, lines 22-25 and Fig. 3, element 22 and 24) each presents the data in different visual user interface display formats (col. 3, lines 7-12 and col. 5, lines 8-12 and 45-48); and wherein the predetermined viewing format is a common visual user interface display format (col. 2, lines 32-34 and col. 5, lines 16-22) for presenting entity data associated with each of the plurality of sections (Fig. 2, element 28, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40 42, and 44) specifying different data (col. 3, lines 6-12; i.e. control features) to be displayed in a same visual user interface format without presenting a same type of entity data in multiple different visual user interface display format (col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon to include wherein two or more of the plurality of data source applications each presents the data in different visual user interface display formats; and wherein the predetermined viewing format is a common visual user interface display format for presenting data associated with each of the plurality of sections specifying different entity data to be displayed in a same

Art Unit: 2121

visual user interface format without presenting a same type of entity data in multiple different visual user interface display format to provide users with less difficulty in operating, as well as need for training in the operation in a range of different applications (col. 2, lines 53-57).

23. As per claim 25, Nixon teaches as set forth above accessing the database includes using a web server (i.e. XML data server) located at a second site geographically separated from the remote site (pg. 5, par. [0040]) to access the entity data stored in the database (pg. 12, par. [0076] and pg. 13, par. [0083]), placing the accessed entity data into a web page in the predetermined viewing format (pg. 13, par. [0084]) at the web server and sending the web page to the remote site (pg. 5, par. [0040] and pg. 20, par. [0125]).

24. As per claim 27, Nixon teaches as set forth above displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree that organizes the entity data based on one or more plant locations (Fig. 5A, element "Area 1" and "Area 2") within the process plant (pg. 6, par. [0044], pg. 14, par. [0088], pg. 15, par. [0096] and pg. 20, par. [0126]).

25. As per claim 28, Nixon teaches as set forth above displaying the display view at the remote site includes presenting entity data in a predetermined viewing format that

organizes the entity data based on device tags (pg. 7, par. [0048] and Fig. 5A and 5B; i.e. indexes) in response to a selection of a section of the navigational tree (pgs. 14-15, par. [0088], [0092] and [0094] and pg. 20, par. [0126] and [0127]).

26. As per claim 30, Nixon teaches as set forth above the entity data includes configuration data (i.e. the interconnections of process control equipment) associated with the device tags (pg. 20, par. [0126]).

27. As per claim 31, Nixon teaches as set forth above the entity data includes calibration data (pg. 7, par. [0052]) associated with the device tags (pg. 20, par. [0126]).

28. As per claim 32, Nixon teaches as set forth above displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree that organizes the entity data based on one or more physical networks (Fig. 5A, element "Area 1" and "Area 2") associated with the process plant (pg. 6, par. [0044], pg. 15, par. [0088] and [0096], pg. 20, par. [0126]).

29. As per claim 33, Nixon teaches as set forth above displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree that organizes the entity data

based on alerts (Fig. 5) generated within the process plant (pg. 7, par. [0052], pg. 14, par. [0088], and pg. 15, element [0096]).

30. As per claim 34, Nixon teaches as set forth above displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a section associated with active alerts and wherein displaying the display view (Fig. 5) includes presenting active alert entity data in a predetermined viewing format (pgs. 7-8, par. [0053]) in response to a selection of the section (pgs. 14-15, par. [0092] and [0094] and pg. 20, par. [0126] and [0127]) associated with the active alerts (pg. 7, par. [0052] and pg. 15, element [0096]).

31. As per claim 36, Nixon teaches as set forth above displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree that organizes the entity data based on calibration events (pg. 7, par. [0052]) within the process plant (pg. 20, par. [0126]).

32. As per claim 42, Nixon teaches as set forth above displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree associated with entity data organized by device tags (pg. 7, par. [0048], pg. 11, par. [0068], pg. 15, par. [0096] and [0098], pg. 20, par. [0126] and [0127] and Fig. 5A and 5B; i.e. indexes).

33. As per claim 43, Nixon teaches as set forth above displaying the first section of the navigational tree includes one or more sub-sections (pg. 7, par. [0048] and pgs. 14-15, par. [0092]; e.g. Fig. 5, element "Areas") associated with device tags (i.e. indexes) organized by one or more of all devices, assigned devices, spare devices and decommissioned devices (pg. 11, par. [0068], pg. 15, par. [0096] and [0098] and pg. 20, par. [0126] and [0127]).

34. Claims 3, 16, 18, 29, 35 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nixon in view of Saleh in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,889,096 (hereinafter Spriggs).

35. As per claim 3, Nixon teaches a viewing format includes a display of audit trail data (pg. 22, par. [0138]).

Nixon does not expressly teach the predetermined viewing format includes a display of audit trail data associated with the device tags.

Saleh does not expressly teach the predetermined viewing format includes a display of audit trail data associated with the device tags.

Spriggs teaches to a display of audit trail data (col. 2, lines 52-59, col. 11, lines 47-57, col. 12, lines 20-22, col. 16, lines 52-55 and col. 33, lines 60-65) associated with the device tags (col. 33, lines 39-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon to include a display of audit trail data associated with the device tags to provide an unified display environment enabling the user to view the enterprise as a whole and navigate to a specific point or parameter quickly and easily (col. 3, lines 49-56).

36. As per claim 16, Nixon teaches to audit trail events associated with the entity data within the process plant (pg. 22, par. [0138]).

Nixon does not expressly teach the navigational tree includes a section specifying audit trail events associated with the entity data within the process plant.

Saleh does not expressly teach the navigational tree includes a section specifying audit trail events associated with the entity data within the process plant.

Spriggs teaches the navigational tree includes a section specifying audit trail events (col. 2, lines 52-59, col. 11, lines 47-57, col. 12, lines 20-22, col. 16, lines 52-55 and col. 33, lines 60-65) associated with the entity data within the process plant (col. 26, lines 45-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon to include the navigational tree includes a section specifying audit trail events associated with the

entity data within the process plant to provide an unified display environment enabling the user to view the enterprise as a whole and navigate to a specific point or parameter quickly and easily (col. 3, lines 49-56).

37. As per claim 18, Nixon does not expressly teach including an alert polling application which polls one or more devices within the process plant for alert information and which sends the alert information to the remote platform for presentation via the predetermined viewing format (pgs. 19-20, par. [0122]).

Saleh does not expressly teach including an alert polling application which polls one or more devices within the process plant for alert information and which sends the alert information to the remote platform for presentation via the predetermined viewing format.

Spriggs teaches an alert polling application which polls one or more devices within the process plant for alert information (col. 12, lines 26-30) and which sends the alert information to the remote platform for presentation via the predetermined viewing format (col. 12, lines 30-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include teaches an alert polling application which polls one or more devices within the process plant for alert information and which sends the alert information to the remote

Art Unit: 2121

platform for presentation via the predetermined viewing format to provide an unified display environment enabling the user to view the enterprise as a whole and navigate to a specific point or parameter quickly and easily (col. 3, lines 49-56).

38. As per claim 29, Nixon teaches the entity data includes audit trail data (pg. 22, par. [0138]).

Nixon does not expressly teach the entity data includes audit trail data associated with the device tags.

Saleh does not expressly teach the entity data includes audit trail data associated with the device tags.

Spriggs teach the entity data includes audit trail data (col. 2, lines 52-59, col. 11, lines 47-57, col. 12, lines 20-22, col. 16, lines 52-55 and col. 33, lines 60-65) associated with the device tags (col. 33, lines 39-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon to include the entity data includes audit trail data associated with the device tags to provide an unified display environment enabling the user to view the enterprise as a whole and navigate to a specific point or parameter quickly and easily (col. 3, lines 49-56).

39. As per claim 35, Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section associated with polling for alerts generated within the process plant, further including initiating an alert polling application that polls for alerts within the process plant in response to a selection of the first section of the navigational, tree and wherein displaying the display view includes presenting alert data obtained by the alert polling application in a predetermined viewing format in response to the selection of the first section of the navigational tree.

Spriggs teaches displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section associated with polling for alerts generated within the process plant (col. 12, lines 26-30), further including initiating an alert polling application that polls for alerts within the process plant in response to a selection of the first section of the navigational tree (col. 13, lines 61-67 and 1-8) and wherein displaying the display view includes presenting alert data obtained by the alert polling application in a predetermined viewing format in response to the selection of the first section of the navigational tree (col. 13, lines 54-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section associated with polling for alerts generated within the process plant, further including initiating an alert polling application that polls for alerts within the process plant in response to a

Art Unit: 2121

selection of the first section of the navigational, tree and wherein displaying the display view includes presenting alert data obtained by the alert polling application in a predetermined viewing format in response to the selection of the first section of the navigational tree to provide an unified display environment enabling the user to view the enterprise as a whole and navigate to a specific point or parameter quickly and easily (col. 3, lines 49-56).

40. As per claim 41, Nixon teaches displaying audit trail entity data (pg. 22, par. [0138]).

Nixon does not expressly teach the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree associated with audit trail entity data.

Saleh does not expressly teach the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree associated with audit trail entity data.

Spriggs teaches the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree (col. 5, lines 10-26, col. 8, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-2) associated with audit trail entity data (col. 2, lines 52-59, col. 11, lines 47-57, col. 12, lines 20-22, col. 16, lines 52-55 and col. 33, lines 60-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon to the navigational tree

includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree associated with audit trail entity data to provide an unified display environment enabling the user to view the enterprise as a whole and navigate to a specific point or parameter quickly and easily (col. 3, lines 49-56).

41. Claims 6, 11-14, 20, 21, 37-40 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nixon in view of Saleh in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0149608 (hereinafter Kall).

42. As per claim 6, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach the calibration data includes a result of at least one calibration procedure.

Kall teaches the calibration data includes a result of at least one calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include calibration data that includes a result of at least one calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

43. As per claim 11, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach the calibration entities include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant.

Kall teaches the calibration entities include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include the calibration entities include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

44. As per claim 12, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach the calibration entities include calibration schedule information for at least one device within the process plant.

Kall teaches to calibration schedule information for at least one device within the process plant (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include calibration schedule information for at least one device within the process plant to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

45. As per claim 13, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach the predetermined viewing format includes a search engine that enables searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure.

Kall teaches to a search engine that enables searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include a search engine that enables searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

46. As per claim 14, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach the predetermined viewing format includes a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or date associated with a calibration procedure.

Kall teaches to a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or date associated with a calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2121

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or date associated with a calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

47. As per claim 20, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach a search engine that searches entity data in the database and presents the entity data located in the search according to the predetermined viewing format.

Kall teaches to a search engine that searches entity data in the database and presents the entity data located in the search according to the predetermined viewing format (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include a search engine that searches entity data in the database and presents the entity data located in the search according to the predetermined viewing format to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

48. As per claim 21, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach the search engine includes a display field having search fields specifying parameters associated with the entity data.

Kall teaches to a search engine includes a display field having search fields specifying parameters associated with the entity data (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include a search engine includes a display field having search fields specifying parameters associated with the entity data to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

49. As per claim 37, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach the calibration events include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant.

Kall teaches the calibration events include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include the calibration events include at least one calibration route defined within the

Art Unit: 2121

process plant to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

50. As per claim 38, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach the calibration events include at least one calibration schedule defined within the process plant.

Kall teaches the calibration events include at least one calibration schedule defined within the process plant (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include the calibration events include at least one calibration schedule defined within the process plant to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

51. As per claim 39, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach displaying the display view includes providing a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure.

Kall teaches a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

52. As per claim 40, Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach displaying the display view includes providing a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or a date associated with a calibration procedure.

Kall teaches to a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or a date associated with a calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in view of Saleh to include a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or a date associated with a calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

53. As per claim 44, Nixon teaches the remote site to enable a user at the remote site (pg. 5, par. [0039] and Fig. 1, element 40) to access to the entity data in the

Art Unit: 2121

database (pg. 5, par. [0041], pg. 13, par. [0082], pg. 8, par. [0088] and Fig. 2, element 102) and to present (pg. 7, par. [0048]) the entity data according to the predetermined viewing format (pg. 7, par. [0048], pg. 11, par. [0069] and pg. 15, par. [0095] and [0096]).

Nixon does not expressly teach to a search engine view.

Saleh does not expressly teach to a search engine view.

Kall teaches to a search engine view (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon to include a search engine view to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

54. Claims 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nixon in view of Saleh in further view of Latzel.

55. As per claim 26, neither Nixon nor Saleh expressly teach the second site is geographically separated from the primary data collection platform.

Latzel teaches to a second site is geographically separated from the primary data

collection platform (pg. 4, par. [0051]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Nixon in further view Saleh to include a second site that is geographically separated from the primary data collection platform to conveniently edit and generate web sites, and provide simplified automated editing of web sites, requiring less technical expertise (pg. 1, par. [0006]).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER L. NORTON whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2121

(571)272-3694. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Albert DeCady/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2121

/JLN/